



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,530	02/27/2004	Scott Musson	BEAS-01374US1	6918
23910	7590	09/04/2007	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER LLP			ULRICH, NICHOLAS S	
650 CALIFORNIA STREET				
14TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108			2173	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/788,530	MUSSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nicholas S. Ulrich	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-67 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-67 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/26/2007. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-67 are pending
2. Claims 1, 22, 23, 24, 34, 39, 40, 41, 50, and 67 have been amended.
3. Claims 1-67 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiigi et al. (US 2003/0014442 A1) and Bladow et al. (US 6115040).

In regard to claims 1, 50, and 67, Shiigi discloses a method and machine readable medium for rendering a graphical user interface (GUI), comprising:
providing for the representation of the GUI as a set of controls wherein the controls are organized in a logical hierarchy (*Paragraph 0014 lines 12-14, Paragraph 0016 and Paragraph 0056: Controls are organized in a template hierarchy which provides entitlement for each of the controls based on the tags specified within the template*);
traversing the representation, wherein the traversing comprises:

associating a theme with a first control in the set of controls (*Paragraph 0082*

lines 4-6: The Object model is invoked;

rendering the first control according to the theme (*Paragraph 0050: step 1*);

rendering any descendants of the first control according to the theme (*Paragraph 0051: Step 2*);

wherein any descendants of the first control can override the theme (*Paragraph 0051 lines 10-12*);

While Shiigi teaches a representation of the GUI as a set of controls, they fail to show the each of the controls has an entitlement that can be used to determine whether or not the control is visible when rendered and wherein one of the set of controls can communicate with another of the set of controls as recited in the claims. Bladow teaches validating a user and determining entitlements for services (*Column 3 lines 47-54: only those services available for a particular user will be displayed. The services listed that a user is entitled to see provide controls to the services*) and a set of controls can communicate with another set of controls (*Paragraph 1 lines 34-48 and Column 3 lines 8-21: The backplane unit provides communication between all components of the user interface system*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Shiigi and Bladow before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering of a GUI taught by Shiigi to include the entitlements and communication of Bladow. It would have been advantageous for one to utilize such a combination as to block users from accessing controls that they do not have rights to use as suggested by Bladow (*Column 3 lines 65-66*).

In regard to claim 18, Shiigi discloses a method for rendering a graphical user interface (GUI), comprising:

accepting a request (*Paragraph 0039 lines 3-4*);

mapping the request to a set of controls that represent the GUI, and wherein the controls are organized in a logical hierarchy (*Paragraph 0014 lines 12-14, Paragraph 0016 and Paragraph 0056: Controls are organized in a template hierarchy which provides entitlement for each of the controls based on the tags specified within the template*);

traversing the representation, wherein the traversing comprises: associating a theme with a first control in the set of controls (*Paragraph 0082 lines 4-6: The Object model is invoked*)

rendering the first control according to the theme (*Paragraph 0050: step 1*);

rendering any descendants of the first control according to the theme (*Paragraph 0051: Step 2*);

and wherein any descendants of the first control can override the theme (*Paragraph 0051 lines 10-12*).

While Shiigi teaches a representation of the GUI as a set of controls, they fail to show the each of the controls has an entitlement that can be used to determine whether or not the control is visible when rendered. Bladow teaches validating a user and determining entitlements for services (*Column 3 lines 47-54: only those services available for a particular user will be displayed. The services listed that a user is*

entitled to see provide controls to the services). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Shiigi and Bladow before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering of a GUI taught by Shiigi to include the entitlements of Bladow. It would have been advantageous for one to utilize such a combination as to block users from accessing controls that they do not have rights to use as suggested by Bladow (*Column 3 lines 65-66*).

In regard to claim 34, Shiigi discloses a method for rendering a graphical user interface (GUI), comprising:

providing for the representation of the GUI as a plurality of controls wherein the controls are organized in a logical hierarchy (*Paragraph 0014 lines 12-14, Paragraph 0016 and Paragraph 0056: Controls are organized in a template hierarchy which provides entitlement for each of the controls based on the tags specified within the template*);

traversing the representation, wherein the traversing comprises: associating a first theme with a first control in the plurality of controls (*Paragraph 0082 lines 4-6: The Object model is invoked*);

rendering the first control according to the first theme (*Paragraph 0050: step 1*);
associating a second theme with a second control in the plurality of controls (*Fig 2 element 32: template extension provides for the second set of controls to be added*);
rendering the second control according to the second theme (*Paragraph 0051: Step 2: the second control is determined from template extension*);

and wherein the second control is a descendant of the first control (*Fig 2 elements 30 and 32: element 30 is first control, element 32 is second control which depends from 30*).

While Shiigi teaches a representation of the GUI as a set of controls, they fail to show the each of the controls has an entitlement that can be used to determine whether or not the control is visible when rendered. Bladow teaches validating a user and determining entitlements for services (*Column 3 lines 47-54: only those services available for a particular user will be displayed. The services listed that a user is entitled to see provide controls to the services*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Shiigi and Bladow before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering of a GUI taught by Shiigi to include the entitlements of Bladow. It would have been advantageous for one to utilize such a combination as to block users from accessing controls that they do not have rights to use as suggested by Bladow (*Column 3 lines 65-66*).

In regard to claims 2, 22, 39, and 51, Shiigi discloses one of the set of controls can respond to an event raised by another of the set of controls (*Paragraph 0079*).

In regard to claims 3, 23, 40, and 52, Shiigi discloses a control can have an interchangeable persistence mechanism (*Fig 5 element 38*).

In regard to claims 4, 24, 41, and 53, Shiigi discloses a control can have an interchangeable rendering mechanism (*Fig 5 element 38*).

In regard to claims 5, 35, and 54, Shiigi discloses accepting a request (*Paragraph 0039 lines 3-4*).

In regard to claims 6, 19, 36, and 55, Shiigi discloses the request in a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) request (*Paragraph 0039: lines 2-4 and Paragraph 0100 line 7*).

In regard to claims 7, 20, 37, and 56, Shiigi discloses the request originates from a web browser (*Paragraph 0039 lines 2-4*).

In regard to claims 8, 21, 38, and 57, Shiigi discloses generating a response (*Paragraph 0041 lines 1-3*).

In regard to claims 9, 25, 42, and 58, Shiigi discloses a control can represent one of: button, text field, menu, table, window, window control, title bar, pop-up window, check-box button, radio button, window frame, desktop, shell, head, body, header, footer, book, page, layout, placeholder, portlet and toggle button (*Paragraph 0055-0075*).

In regard to claims 10, 26, and 59, Shiigi discloses associating the theme with first control can occur when the first control is rendered (*Paragraph 0050: Master template defines the first controls when rendered*).

In regard to claims 11, 27, 43, and 60, Shiigi discloses the first control inherits the theme from a parent control (*Paragraph 0047/lines 11-13*).

In regard to claims 12, 28, 44, and 61, Shiigi discloses the theme specifies the appearance and/or functioning of an control in the GUI (*Paragraph 0016*).

In regard to claims 13, 29, 45, and 62, Shiigi discloses rendering the first control according to the theme can be accomplished in parallel with rendering of other controls (*Fig 3 step 1 elements 36 A and 36 C: Two controls have been rendered simultaneously with the master template*).

In regard to claims 14, 30, 46, and 63, Shiigi discloses the theme can be specified in whole or in part by a properties file (*Paragraph 0078 lines 1-4: template files have properties which define the theme of the page*).

In regard to claims 15, 31, 47, and 64, Shiigi discloses the properties file can include at least one of: 1) cascading style sheet; 2) Java Server Page; 3) Extensible Markup Language; 4) text; 5) Hypertext Markup Language; 6) Extensible Hypertext

Art Unit: 2173

Markup Language; 7) JavaScript; and 8) Flash MX (*Paragraph 0078 line 4: using HTML*).

In regard to claims 16, 32, 48, and 65, Shiigi discloses the properties file can specify at least one image (*Paragraph 0057*).

In regard to claims 17, 33, 49, and 66, Shiigi discloses the GUI is part of a portal on the World Wide Web (*Paragraph 0100*).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments, see arguments/remarks, filed 6/26/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-67 under 35 USC 102 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Bladow et al (US 6115040).

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas S. Ulrich whose telephone number is 571-270-1397. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 9:00 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on 571-272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nicholas Ulrich
8/24/2007
2173



JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100